arXiv:1102.4036v2 [math.RT] 2 May 2011

NILPOTENT PIECES IN THE DUAL OF ODD ORTHOGONAL LIE ALGEBRAS

TING XUE

To George Lusztig on the occasion of his 65th birthday

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbf{k}$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p \geq 0$. Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group over $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ the Lie algebra of G. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dual vector space of $\mathfrak{g}$. Note that G acts on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ by coadjoint action. Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ be the variety of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ (where an element $\xi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbf{k}$ is called nilpotent if it annihilates some Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, see [1]). Let $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the reductive group over $\mathbb{C}$ of the same type as G. In [4], Lusztig proposes a definition of a partition of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ into smooth locally closed G-stable pieces, called nilpotent pieces which are indexed by the unipotent classes in $G_{\mathbb{C}}$. The case where G is of type A, C, or D has been illustrated in [4]. We treat in this note the case where G is of type B.

In section 2 we recall the definition of nilpotent pieces in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ that Lusztig proposes and state the main theorem. We also include Lusztig's result (and proof) on the number of rational points in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ over finite fields of characteristic 2 (where G is of type B, see 2.5). In section 3 we give an explicit description of the set $\mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!}$ (see 2.1) involved in the definition of nilpotent pieces, where a key definition is suggested by Lusztig (see 3.1). The main theorem is proved in section 4.

Acknowledgement I wish to thank George Lusztig for suggesting a key definition, for allowing me to include his proof on the number of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}^*$, and for many helpful discussions.

2. Preliminaries and statement of the main theorem

2.1. In this subsection we recall the definition of nilpotent pieces in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ that Lusztig proposes (see [4] for more details). Let $\mathfrak{D}_{G_{\mathbb{C}}}$ be the set of all $f \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^*, G_{\mathbb{C}})$ such that there exists a homomorphism of algebraic groups $\tilde{f} : SL_2(\mathbb{C}) \to G_{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\tilde{f}\begin{pmatrix} r & 0 \\ 0 & r^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = f(r)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Let $\mathfrak{D}_G$ be the set of all $\delta \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{k}^*, G)$ such that the image of δ in $G\backslash\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{k}^*, G) = G_{\mathbb{C}}\backslash\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^*, G_{\mathbb{C}})$ can be represented by an element in $\mathfrak{D}_{G_{\mathbb{C}}}$.

Let $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}_G$. We have $\mathfrak{g} = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}_i^\delta$, where $\mathfrak{g}_i^\delta = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} | \mathrm{Ad}(\delta(r))x = r^i x,\ \forall\ r \in \mathbf{k}^*\}$. We set $\mathfrak{g}_{\geq i}^\delta = \oplus_{i'\geq i}\mathfrak{g}_{i'}^\delta$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathfrak{g}_j^{*\delta} = \mathrm{Ann}(\oplus_{i\neq -j}\mathfrak{g}_i^\delta) \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$. We have $\mathfrak{g}^* = \oplus_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathfrak{g}_j^{*\delta}$.

For any $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, denote $Z_G(\xi)$ the centralizer of ξ in G under the coadjoint action. Let

$$\mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!} = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta} | Z_G(\xi) \subset G_{\geq 0}^\delta\},$$

where $G_{\geq 0}^\delta$ is the (well-defined) closed connected subgroup of G such that its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}_{\geq 0}^\delta$.

Let D_G be the set of equivalence classes in $\mathfrak{D}_G$, where δ and δ' in $\mathfrak{D}_G$ are said to be equivalent if for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{g}^{\delta}_{\geq i} = \mathfrak{g}^{\delta'}_{\geq i}$. Let $\Delta \in D_G$. We write $G^{\Delta}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathfrak{g}^{\Delta}_{\geq i}$ instead of $G^{\delta}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathfrak{g}^{\delta}_{\geq i}$ for $\delta \in \Delta$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq j} = \mathrm{Ann}(\mathfrak{g}^{\Delta}_{\geq -j+1})$. Then $\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq j} = \oplus_{j' \geq j} \mathfrak{g}^{*\delta}_{j'}$ $(\delta \in \Delta)$. For any $\delta \in \Delta$, let $\Sigma^{*\delta} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2}/\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 3}$ be the image of $\mathfrak{g}^{*\delta !}_{2} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{*\delta}_{2}$ under the obvious isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}^{*\delta}_{2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2}/\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 3}$. Then $\Sigma^{*\delta}$ is independent of the choice of δ in Δ; we denote it by $\Sigma^{*\Delta}$. Let $\sigma^{*\Delta} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2}$ be the inverse image of $\Sigma^{*\Delta}$ under the obvious map $\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2} \to \mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2}/\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 3}$. Then $\sigma^{*\Delta}$ is stable under the coadjoint action of $G^{\Delta}_{\geq 0}$ on $\mathfrak{g}^{*\Delta}_{\geq 2}$. We have a map

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{g}^*} : \sqcup_{\Delta \in D_G} \sigma^{*\Delta} \to \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}, \ \xi \mapsto \xi.$$

Theorem 2.1. *If G is of type B, then the map $\Psi_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is a bijection.*

In [4] Lusztig conjectures that $\Psi_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is a bijection for any G and proves this in the case where G is of type A, C or D. Theorem 2.1 will be proved in section 4. We can assume that G is the odd special orthogonal group.

Let $\mathfrak{U}_G$ be the set of G-orbits on D_G. Then $\mathfrak{U}_G$ is a finite set that depends only on the type of G, not on $\mathbf{k}$ (see [3]). For any $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{U}_G$, we set

$$\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{g}^*} = \Psi_{\mathfrak{g}^*}(\sqcup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{O}} \sigma^{*\Delta}).$$

The subsets $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ are called *pieces* of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$. They form a partition of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ into smooth locally closed subvarieties (which are unions of G-orbits) indexed by $\mathfrak{U}_G = \mathfrak{U}_{G_{\mathbb{C}}}$.

2.2. Let $\mathbf{V}$ be a vector space over $\mathbf{k}$ equipped with a nondegenerate quadratic form $Q : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{k}$. Let $\beta : \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{k}$ be the bilinear form associated to Q, namely, $\beta(v, v') = Q(v+v') - Q(v) - Q(v')$ for all $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$. Then $Q : \mathrm{Rad}(Q) = \{v \in \mathbf{V} | \beta(v, \mathbf{V}) = 0\} \to \mathbf{k}$ is injective and $\mathrm{Rad}(Q) = 0$ unless $p = 2$ and $\dim \mathbf{V}$ is odd. The special orthogonal group $SO(\mathbf{V})$ is the identity component of $O(\mathbf{V}) = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathbf{V}) |\ Q(gv) = Q(v),\ \forall\ v \in \mathbf{V}\}$ and its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V}) = \{x \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbf{V}) |\ \beta(xv, v) = 0,\ \forall\ v \in \mathbf{V} \text{ and } x|_{\mathrm{Rad}(Q)} = 0\}$.

A $\mathbb{Z}$-grading $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$ of $\mathbf{V}$ is called an *o-good* grading if $\dim \mathbf{V}^a = \dim \mathbf{V}^{-a} \geq \dim \mathbf{V}^{-a-2}$ for all $a \geq 0$, $\dim \mathbf{V}^a$ is even for all odd a, $\beta(\mathbf{V}^a, \mathbf{V}^b) = 0$ whenever $a + b \neq 0$, and $Q|_{\mathbf{V}^a} = 0$ for all $a \neq 0$.

A filtration $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $\mathbf{V}$ (where $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a+1} \subset \mathbf{V}^{\geq a}$, $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \{0\}$ for some a and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}$ for some a) is called a Q-filtration if $Q|_{\mathbf{V}^{\geq a}} = 0$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq 1-a} = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})^{\perp}$ for any $a \geq 1$.

2.3. From now on we assume that $\mathbf{V}$ is of dimension $2N+1$, Q is a fixed nondegenerate quadratic form on $\mathbf{V}$ with associated bilinear form β and that $G = SO(\mathbf{V})$ (with respect to Q). Let R denote the radical $\mathrm{Rad}(Q)$ of Q. For any subspace $\mathbf{W} \subset \mathbf{V}$, let $\mathbf{W}^{\perp}$ denote the set $\{v \in \mathbf{V} | \beta(v, \mathbf{W}) = 0\}$.

To give an element $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}_G$ is the same as to give an o-good grading $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$ of $\mathbf{V}$ (δ is given by $\delta(r)|_{\mathbf{V}^a} = r^a$ for all $r \in \mathbf{k}^*$ and all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, see [3, 1.5]). Let $\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ be the set of all Q-filtrations $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that there exists an o-good grading $\oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$ of $\mathbf{V}$ with $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a' \geq a} \mathbf{V}^{a'}$. The set $\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ and the set D_G (see 2.1) are identified as follows (see [3, 2.7]). Let $[\delta] \in D_G$ be the equivalence class containing $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}_G$ and let $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$ be the o-good grading corresponding to δ. Then $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})$ with $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a' \geq a} \mathbf{V}^{a'}$ is the element of $\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ corresponding to $[\delta]$.

2.4. Let $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ denote the set of all symplectic bilinear forms on $\mathbf{V}$. In [6, 3.1], we have defined a map (assume $p = 2$)

$$\mathfrak{g}^* \to \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V}),\ \xi \mapsto \beta_{\xi},$$

where $\beta_\xi(v,v')=\beta(Xv,v')-\beta(v,Xv')$, $\forall\ v,v'\in\mathbf{V}$ and X is such that $\xi(x)=\mathrm{tr}(Xx)$, $\forall\ x\in\mathfrak{g}$. In fact for arbitrary p this map makes sense and is a vector space isomorphism. In the following we denote by β_ξ the symplectic bilinear form that corresponds to $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}^*$ under this map.

Let $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$ denote the set of all symplectic bilinear forms β_ξ with $\xi\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$.

Assume $p=2$ and $\beta_\xi\in\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$. There are a unique $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and a unique set of vectors $\{v_i, i\in[0,m]\}$ such that (see [6, Lemma 3.5])

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(a)}\quad &\beta(v_m,v)=0,\ \beta_\xi(v_i,v)=\beta(v_{i-1},v), i\in[1,m],\ \beta_\xi(v_0,v)=0, \forall\ v\in\mathbf{V};\\ &Q(v_i)=0, i\in[0,m-1],\ Q(v_m)=1.\end{aligned}$$

2.5. The proofs in this subsection are due to G. Lusztig.

A basis $(e_i)_{i\in[-N,N]}$ of $\mathbf{V}$ is said to be *good* if $\beta(e_i,e_j)=\delta_{i+j,0}+\delta_{i,0}\delta_{j,0}$, for all $i,j\in[-N,N]$, and $Q(e_i)=\delta_{i,0}$ for all $i\in[-N,N]$.

We show that the following two conditions are equivalent:

(a1) $\beta_\xi\in\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$;

(a2) there exists a *good* basis $(e_i)_{i\in[-N,N]}$ of $\mathbf{V}$ such that $i+j\geq 0$ implies $\beta_\xi(e_i,e_j)=0$.

Assume $\beta_\xi\in\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$. We can find a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\xi(\mathfrak{b})=0$. There exists a *good* basis $(e_i)_{i\in[-N,N]}$ of $\mathbf{V}$ such that for all $x\in\mathfrak{b}$, $xe_i=\sum_{j\geq i}x_{ij}e_j$ for all $i\in[-N,N]$, where $x_{ij}+x_{-j,-i}=0$ for all $i,j\in[-N,N]-\{0\}$, $x_{i,-i}=0$ for all $i\in[-N,N]-\{0\}$, $x_{0,i}+2x_{-i,0}=0$ for all $i\in[-N,N]-\{0\}$ and $2x_{0,0}=0$. We take $X\in\mathrm{End}(\mathbf{V})$ such that $\xi(x)=\mathrm{tr}(Xx)$ for all $x\in\mathfrak{g}$. Assume $Xe_i=\sum_j X_{ij}e_j$. For $x\in\mathfrak{b}$, we have $\mathrm{tr}(Xx)=\sum_{-N\leq j\leq i\leq -1}(X_{ij}-X_{-j,-i})x_{ji}+\sum_{-N\leq j<i\leq -1}(X_{-i,j}-X_{-j,i})x_{j,-i}+\sum_{j<0}(X_{0,j}-2X_{-j,0})x_{j,0}$. It follows from $\xi(\mathfrak{b})=0$ that $X_{ij}-X_{-j,-i}=0$ for all $i\geq j$, and $X_{0j}-2X_{-j,0}=0$ for all $j\in[-N,-1]$. Now we have $\beta_\xi(e_i,e_j)=X_{i,-j}-X_{j,-i}=0$ for $i,j\in[-N,N]-\{0\}$, $i\geq -j$; $\beta_\xi(e_0,e_0)=0$ and $\beta_\xi(e_0,e_j)=X_{0,-j}-2X_{j0}=0$ for $j\in[1,N]$. Thus (a2) holds.

Conversely assume (a2) holds. Let $(e_i)_{i\in[-N,N]}$ be a basis of $\mathbf{V}$ as in (a2). Let X and X_{ij} be as in the first part of the proof. We have for $i,j\in[-N,N]-\{0\}$, $i\geq -j$, $X_{i,-j}-X_{j,-i}=0$; and for $j\in[1,N]$, $X_{0,-j}-2X_{j0}=0$. Let $\mathfrak{b}$ be a Borel subalgebra related to (e_i) as in the first part of the proof. Then $\xi(\mathfrak{b})=0$. Hence (a1) holds.

We assume now that $\mathbf{k}$ is an algebraic closure of the finite prime field $\mathbf{F}_2$ and that $\dim\mathbf{V}\geq 3$. We choose an $\mathbf{F}_2$ rational structure on $\mathbf{V}$ such that Q is defined over $\mathbf{F}_2$. Then the Frobenius map F relative to this $\mathbf{F}_2$ structure acts naturally and compatibly on $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$. We show that

(b) $|\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}^{F^n}|=q^{2N^2}$, *where* $q=2^n$.

For any $m\in[0,N]$, let S_m be the set of all sequences $v_*=(v_0,\ldots,v_{m-1})$ of linearly independent vectors in $\mathbf{V}$ such that $Q|_{\mathrm{span}\{v_i,i\in[0,m-1]\}}=0$. We have

(c) $|S_m^{F^n}|=(q^{2N}-1)(q^{2N-2}-1)\cdots(q^{2N-2m+2}-1)q^{m(m-1)/2}$.

For each $v_*\in S_m$, let $\mathcal{N}_{v_*}$ be the set of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V}')=\{T\in\mathrm{End}(\mathbf{V}')|\beta'(Tv',v')=0,\ \forall\ v'\in\mathbf{V}'\}$, where $\mathbf{V}'=L^\perp/L$ with $L=\mathrm{span}\{v_i,i\in[0,m-1]\}\oplus R$ and β' is the bilinear form on $\mathbf{V}'$ induced by β. By a result of Springer (see [5]), we have

(d) $|\mathcal{N}_{v_*}^{F^n}| = q^{2(N-m)(N-m-1)}$.

Fix a pair (v_*, T) where $v_* \in S_m$ and $T \in \mathcal{N}_{v_*}$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the set of all $(,) \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ such that

(1) $(v_0, v) = 0$, $(v_i, v) = \beta(v_{i-1}, v)$, $i \in [1, m-1]$, for all $v \in \mathbf{V}$;

(2) $(r, v) = \beta(v_{m-1}, v)$ for all $v \in \mathbf{V}$, where $r \in R$ is such that $Q(r) = 1$;

(3) $\beta'(Tv', v'') = (v', v'')'$, $\forall\ v', v'' \in \mathbf{V}'$, where $(,)'$ is the bilinear form on $\mathbf{V}'$ induced by $(,)$ (note that $(L, L^{\perp}) = 0$).

We show that

(e) $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$*;*

(f) $\mathcal{E}$ *is an affine space of dimension* $2m(N-m) + m(m-1)/2$.

Let $(,) \in \mathcal{E}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ be a complement of L in $L^{\perp}$ and let L' be a complement to $L^{\perp}$ in $\mathbf{V}$ such that $Q|_{L'} = 0$ and $\beta(L', \tilde{\mathbf{V}}) = 0$. Note that $\beta|_{\tilde{\mathbf{V}}}$ is nondegenerate and can be identified with β' on $\mathbf{V}'$. We can regard $T \in \mathcal{N}_{v_*}$ as an element $\tilde{T} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{o}(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})}$ and identify $(,)|_{\tilde{\mathbf{V}}}$ with $(,)'$ on $\mathbf{V}'$. Let $N' = N - m$. We can find a basis $(e_i)_{i \in [-N', N'] - \{0\}}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ such that $\beta(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{i+j,0}$ for all $i, j \in [-N', N'] - \{0\}$, $Q(e_i) = 0$ for all $i \in [-N', N']$, and $(e_i, e_j) = 0$ for all $i + j \geq 0$ (since $(v, v') = \beta(\tilde{T}v, v')$ on $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\tilde{T}$ is nilpotent). We extend it to a basis of $\mathbf{V}$ by setting $e_{N'+j} = v_{m-j}$, $j \in [1, m]$, $e_0 = r$ and $e_{-N'-j} = u_{m-j}$, $j \in [1, m]$, where u_{m-j} are elements in L' such that $\beta(v_{m-j}, u_{m-j'}) = \delta_{j,j'}$. It follows that $(e_i)_{i \in [-N, N]}$ is a good basis of $\mathbf{V}$. We show that $(e_i, e_j) = 0$ if $i, j \in [-N, N]$ and $i + j \geq 0$. For $j, j' \in [1, m-1]$ and $j' \geq j$, $(e_{-N'-j}, e_{N'+j'}) = (u_{m-j}, v_{m-j'}) = \beta(u_{m-j}, v_{m-j'-1}) = 0$; for $i \in [-N', N'] - \{0\}$, $j \in [1, m-1]$, $(e_i, e_{N'+j}) = (e_i, v_{m-j}) = \beta(e_i, v_{m-j-1}) = 0$; for $j, j' \in [1, m-1]$, $(e_{N'+j}, e_{N'+j'}) = \beta(v_{m-j}, v_{m-j'-1}) = 0$; for $j \in [0, N]$, $(e_0, e_j) = \beta(v_{m-1}, e_j) = 0$ and for $i \in [-N, N]$, $(e_i, e_{N'+m}) = (e_i, v_0) = 0$. This completes the proof of (e) (we use (a1)$\Leftrightarrow$(a2)).

We prove (f). Let $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}, L'$ be as in the proof of (e). Let $u_0, \ldots, u_{m-1}$ be a basis of L' and let $(e_i)_{i \in [-N', N'] - \{0\}}$ be a basis of $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$. To specify an element $(,)$ of $\mathcal{E}$, we need to specify (u_i, e_j), $i \in [0, m-1]$, $j \in [-N', N'] - \{0\}$ and (u_i, u_j) for $i < j$ in $[0, m-1]$. These provide coordinates in $\mathcal{E}$. Thus (f) follows.

Let $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$. Let $\{v_i, i \in [0, m]\}$ be the set of vectors as in (2.4 (a)). Then v_i, $i \in [0, m]$ are linearly independent, $v_m \in R$ and $Q|_{\text{span}\{v_i, i \in [0, m-1]\}} = 0$ (see [6, Lemmas 3.5, 3.7]). We set $L = \text{span}\{v_i, i \in [0, m]\}$ and $\mathbf{V}' = L^{\perp}/L$. The bilinear form β induces a nondegenerate bilinear form β' on $\mathbf{V}'$. For any $x \in L$, $\beta_\xi(x, L^{\perp}) = 0$ since $\beta_\xi(v_0, \mathbf{V}) = 0$ and $\beta_\xi(v_i, L^{\perp}) = \beta(v_{i-1}, L^{\perp}) = 0$ for all $i \in [1, m]$. Hence β_ξ induces a symplectic bilinear form β'_ξ on $\mathbf{V}'$. We define $T'_\xi : \mathbf{V}' \to \mathbf{V}'$ by $\beta'(T'_\xi v', v'') = \beta'_\xi(v', v'')$ for any $v', v'' \in \mathbf{V}'$. Note that $T'_\xi \in \mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V}')$ and T'_ξ is nilpotent (see [6, Lemma 3.11]). Thus we have a natural map $\beta_\xi \mapsto (v_* = (v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1}), T'_\xi)$ from $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$ to the set of all pairs (v_*, T), where $v_* \in S_m$ for some $m \in [0, N]$ and $T \in \mathcal{N}_{v_*}$. The fiber of this map at (v_*, T) is the set $\mathcal{E}$ consisting of all $(,)$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ satisfying the above conditions (1)-(3) (see (e)). Now using (c), (d) and (f) we get

$$|\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}^{F^n}| = \sum_{m \in [0, N]} \sum_{v_* \in S_m^{F^n}} q^{2(N-m)(N-m-1)} q^{2m(N-m) + m(m-1)/2}$$

$$= q^{2N^2} \sum_{m \in [0, N]} (1 - q^{-2N})(1 - q^{-2N+2}) \cdots (1 - q^{-2N+2m-2}) q^{-2N+2m}$$

Let $X_N = \sum_{m=0}^{N}(1-q^N)(1-q^{N-1})\cdots(1-q^{N-m+1})q^{N-m}$. We have $X_1 = 1$ and $X_{N+1} = q^{N+1} + (1-q^{N+1})X_N$. Hence $X_N = 1$ by induction on N and (b) follows.

3. The set $\mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!}$

In this section we fix $\delta \in \mathfrak{D}_G$ and the corresponding o-good grading $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{V}^a$ of $\mathbf{V}$ (see 2.3).

3.1. Let $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$ be the set of all symplectic bilinear forms $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ such that $\beta_\xi(\mathbf{V}^a, \mathbf{V}^b) = 0$, whenever $a + b \neq -2$. For $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$, define $A : \mathbf{V}^a \to \mathbf{V}^{a+2}$ for all $a \neq -2$ by

$$\beta(Ax^a, x^{-a-2}) = \beta_\xi(x^a, x^{-a-2}), \forall\ x^a \in \mathbf{V}^a, x^{-a-2} \in \mathbf{V}^{-a-2}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0$ be the set of all $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$ such that (this definition is suggested by Lusztig):

(a) all maps $\mathbf{V}^0 \xrightarrow{A} \mathbf{V}^2 \xrightarrow{A} \cdots \xrightarrow{A} \mathbf{V}^{2n} \xrightarrow{A} \cdots$ are surjective, and $Q|_{\ker(A^n:\mathbf{V}^0\to\mathbf{V}^{2n})}$ is nondegenerate for all $n \geq 1$;

(b) all maps $\mathbf{V}^{-1} \xrightarrow{A} \mathbf{V}^1 \xrightarrow{A} \cdots \xrightarrow{A} \mathbf{V}^{2n-1} \xrightarrow{A} \cdots$ are surjective, and the symplectic form $(-,-)_{-1} := \beta(A-,-)$ on $\ker(A^n : \mathbf{V}^{-1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n-1})$ is nondegenerate for all $n \geq 1$.

Proposition 3.1. *We have $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!}$ if and only if $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0$.*

Note that $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta}$ if and only if $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$ (since $\delta(r)|_{\mathbf{V}^a} = r^a$, and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta}$ iff $\beta_\xi(\delta(r)v, \delta(r)v') = r^{-2}\beta_\xi(v, v')$ for all $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$, $r \in \mathbf{k}^*$). The proof of the proposition in the case when $p \neq 2$ is given in 3.2 and that when $p = 2$ is given in 3.3-3.7. In general, x^k denotes an element in $\mathbf{V}^k$.

We first show that the condition (b) can be reformulated as follows

(b$'$) $A^{2n-1} : \mathbf{V}^{-2n+1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n-1}$ is an isomorphism for all $n \geq 1$.

Let $K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} = \ker(A^n : \mathbf{V}^{-1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n-1})$ and $I_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} = \mathrm{Im}(A^{n-1} : \mathbf{V}^{-2n+1} \to \mathbf{V}^{-1})$. Assume (b) holds. We show that $A^{2n-1} : \mathbf{V}^{-2n+1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n-1}$ is injective. Assume $A^{2n-1}x^{-2n+1} = 0$. Then $A^{n-1}x^{-2n+1} \in \mathrm{Rad}((,)_{-1}|_{K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}}}) = \{0\}$ and $\beta(\mathbf{V}^{2n-1}, x^{-2n+1}) = \beta(A^n\mathbf{V}^{-1}, x^{-2n+1}) = \beta(\mathbf{V}^{-1}, A^n x^{-2n+1}) = 0$ (note that $A^n : \mathbf{V}^{-1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n-1}$ is surjective) . Hence $x^{-2n+1} = 0$ (since $\beta : \mathbf{V}^a \times \mathbf{V}^{-a} \to \mathbf{k}$ is nondegenerate for all $a \neq 0$). Now (b$'$) follows since $\dim \mathbf{V}^{-2n+1} = \dim \mathbf{V}^{2n-1}$.

Conversely assume (b$'$) holds. It is clear that all maps A in (b) are surjective. We have $\mathbf{V}^{-1} = I_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} \oplus K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}}$ (since $I_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} \cap K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} = \{0\}$, $\dim I_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} = \dim \mathbf{V}^{-2n+1}$ and $\dim K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}} = \dim \mathbf{V}^{-1} - \dim \mathbf{V}^{2n-1}$). Assume $x^{-1} \in \mathrm{Rad}((,)_{-1}|_{K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}}})$. Then $\beta(Ax^{-1}, \mathbf{V}^{-1}) = 0$. It follows that $Ax^{-1} = 0$ and $x^{-1} = 0$ (since $A : \mathbf{V}^{-1} \to \mathbf{V}^1$ is an isomorphism). Hence (b) holds.

3.2. Assume in this subsection that $p \neq 2$. Let $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$ and let $A : \mathbf{V}^a \to \mathbf{V}^{a+2}$, $a \neq -2$ be as in 3.1. We define $A : \mathbf{V}^{-2} \to \mathbf{V}^0$ by $\beta(Ax^{-2}, x^0) = \beta_\xi(x^{-2}, x^0), \forall\ x^0 \in \mathbf{V}^0, x^{-2} \in \mathbf{V}^{-2}$. The collection of maps $A : \mathbf{V}^a \to \mathbf{V}^{a+2}$ gives rise to a map $A : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$, $A(\sum_a x^a) = \sum_a Ax^a$. Note that for any $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$, $\beta(Av, v') = \beta_\xi(v, v')$. It follows that $A \in \mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V})_2 := \{T \in \mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V}) | T\mathbf{V}^a \subset \mathbf{V}^{a+2}\}$.

We show that condition (a) in 3.1 is equivalent to

(a$'$) $A^{2n} : \mathbf{V}^{-2n} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n}$ is an isomorphism for all $n \geq 1$.

Let $\ker(A^n : \mathbf{V}^0 \to \mathbf{V}^{2n}) = K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}$ and $\mathrm{Im}(A^n : \mathbf{V}^{-2n} \to \mathbf{V}^0) = I_{2n,\mathbf{V}}$. Assume (a$'$) holds.

It is clear that all maps $A : \mathbf{V}^{2n} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n+2}$ are surjective. We have $\mathbf{V}^0 = K_{2n,\mathbf{V}} \oplus I_{2n,\mathbf{V}}$ and thus $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}}) \subset \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{\mathbf{V}^0}) = \{0\}$. Hence (a) holds. Conversely assume (a) holds. Suppose $A^{2n}x^{-2n} = 0$. Then $A^n x^{-2n} \in \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n-1,\mathbf{V}}}) = \{0\}$. It follows that $\beta(x^{-2n}, \mathbf{V}^{2n}) = \beta(A^n x^{-2n}, \mathbf{V}^0) = 0$ and thus $x^{-2n} = 0$. Hence $A^{2n} : \mathbf{V}^{-2n} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n}$ is injective and (a′) follows.

It is easy to see that $g \in Z_G(\xi)$ if and only if $g \in Z_G(A)$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta}$ if and only if $A \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{\delta} = \mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{V})_2$, and thus $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!}$ if and only if $A \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{\delta!} := \{T \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{\delta} | Z_G(T) \subset G_{\geq 0}^{\delta}\}$. By [3, 1.5], $A \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{\delta!}$ if and only if A satisfies (a′) and 3.1 (b′). Proposition 3.1 follows in this case.

3.3. We assume $p = 2$ through subsection 3.7. Let $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$. Let $A : \mathbf{V}^a \to \mathbf{V}^{a+2}$, $a \neq -2$ be defined for β_ξ as in 3.1. Note that $R \subset \mathbf{V}^0$. Let $\bar{m}$ be the unique integer such that

$$A^{\bar{m}}R \neq 0, A^{\bar{m}+1}R = 0.$$

We define $\bar{v}_{\bar{m}} \in R$ by $Q(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}) = 1$ and set (if $\bar{m} > 0$)

$$\bar{v}_i = A^{\bar{m}-i}\bar{v}_{\bar{m}},\ i \in [0, \bar{m}-1].$$

Assume $\bar{m} = 0$. Let

$\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ be a complementary subspace of $\mathrm{span}\{\bar{v}_0\}$ in $\mathbf{V}^0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a = \mathbf{V}^a$ for all $a \neq 0$.

Assume $\bar{m} > 0$. We choose $\bar{u}_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{-2\bar{m}}$ such that $\beta(\bar{u}_0, \bar{v}_0) = 1$, and set

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{u}_i = A^i\bar{u}_0,\ i \in [1, \bar{m}-1];\\
&\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2i} = \{v \in \mathbf{V}^{-2i} | \beta(v, \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-i}) = 0\},\ \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2i} = \{v \in \mathbf{V}^{2i} | \beta(v, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-i}) = 0\},\ i \in [1, \bar{m}],\\
&\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 = \{v \in \mathbf{V}^0 | \beta_\xi(v, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-1}) = 0\},\ \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a = \mathbf{V}^a,\ \text{if } a \text{ is odd, or } a \text{ is even and } a \notin [-2\bar{m}, 2\bar{m}].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{V}^{2j} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2j} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-j}\}$, $j \in [0, \bar{m}]$; $\mathbf{V}^{-2j} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2j} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\bar{u}_{\bar{m}-j}\}$, $j \in [1, \bar{m}]$.

We show that $A(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a) \subset \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2}$, $a \neq -2$. This is clear except when $\bar{m} > 0$ and $a = 2j$, $j \in [-\bar{m}-1, -2]$ and $j \in [0, \bar{m}-1]$. If $w^0 \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$, then $\beta(Aw^0, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-1}) = \beta_\xi(w^0, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-1}) = 0$; if $w^{2j} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2j}$, $j \in [1, \bar{m}-1]$, then $\beta(Aw^{2j}, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-j-1}) = \beta_\xi(w^{2j}, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-j-1}) = \beta(w^{2j}, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-j}) = 0$; if $w^{-2j} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2j}$, $j \in [2, \bar{m}]$, then $\beta(Aw^{-2j}, \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-j+1}) = \beta_\xi(w^{-2j}, \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-j+1}) = \beta(w^{-2j}, \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-j}) = 0$; if $w^{-2\bar{m}-2} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}-2}$, then $\beta(Aw^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \bar{v}_0) = \beta_\xi(w^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \bar{v}_0) = \beta(w^{-2\bar{m}-2}, A\bar{v}_0) = 0$. Hence in each case $Aw^{2j} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2j+2}$.

Let $\bar{A} = A|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2}$, $a \neq -2$, and define $\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ by $\beta(\bar{A}w^{-2}, w^0) = \beta_\xi(w^{-2}, w^0)$ (note that $\beta|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0}$ is nondegenerate). Then we have a collection of maps

$$\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2} \quad \forall\ a$$

such that

$$\beta(\bar{A}w^a, w^{-a-2}) = \beta_\xi(w^a, w^{-a-2}), \forall\ w^a \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a,\ w^{-a-2} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-a-2}.$$

3.4. Let β_ξ, $\bar{m}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$ and $\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2}$ be as in 3.3. We show that condition (a) in 3.1 holds if and only if the following two conditions (a1) and (a2) hold:

(a1) for any $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$, the map $\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is injective and $Q|_{\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)}$ is nondegenerate;

(a2) for any $n \geq \bar{m}+1$, $\bar{A}^{2n} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is an isomorphism and $\dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is even.

We first show that 3.1 (a) holds if and only if (a1′) and (a2) hold, where (a1$'$) for any $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$, the map $\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is surjective and $Q|_{\ker(\bar{A}^n:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n})}$ is nondegenerate.

We denote $\ker(A^n : \mathbf{V}^0 \to \mathbf{V}^{2n}) = K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}$, $\ker(\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}) = K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0) = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$. Then one easily shows that

$$K_{2n,\mathbf{V}} = K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}, n \in [1, \bar{m}];\ K_{2n,\mathbf{V}} = K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}\}, n \geq \bar{m} + 1.$$

Assume 3.1 (a) holds. We first show that $\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n+2}$ is surjective for all $n \geq 0$. This is clear for $n > \bar{m}$. Let $n \in [0, \bar{m}]$ and $w^{2n+2} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n+2}$. There exists $v^{2n} \in \mathbf{V}^{2n}$ such that $Av^{2n} = w^{2n+2}$. We have $\beta(v^{2n}, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-n}) = \beta(Av^{2n}, \bar{u}_{\bar{m}-n-1}) = 0$ (if $n \in [0, \bar{m} - 1]$) and $Av^{2\bar{m}} = A(w^{2\bar{m}} + a\bar{v}_0) = \bar{A}w^{2\bar{m}}$. Now (a1$'$) follows since $K_{2n,\mathbf{V}} = K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$ for $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$. We verify (a2). We show that $\bar{A}^{2n} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is injective for all $n \geq \bar{m} + 1$. Assume $\bar{A}^{2n}w^{-2n} = 0$ for some $w^{-2n} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n}$. Then $\bar{A}^n w^{-2n} \in \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = \{0\}$ (note that $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}}) = \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}\}$ and that $Q|_{K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}}$ is nondegenerate). It follows that $\bar{A}^n w^{-2n} = 0$ and $\dim K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$ is even. Now $w^{-2n} = 0$ since $\beta(w^{-2n}, \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}) = \beta(\bar{A}^n w^{-2n}, \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0) = 0$, and $\dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is even since $\dim K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 - \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ and $\dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is even. Hence (a2) holds.

Assume (a1$'$) and (a2) hold. It is clear that $A : \mathbf{V}^{2n} \to \mathbf{V}^{2n+2}$ is surjective for all $n \geq 0$, and $Q|_{K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}}$ is nondegenerate for all $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$ (since $K_{2n,\mathbf{V}} = K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$). Assume $n \geq \bar{m} + 1$. We have $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \oplus K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$ (since $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \{0\}$, $\dim I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n}$ and $\dim K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 - \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$) and thus $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) \subset \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0}) = \{0\}$. Hence $Q|_{K_{2n,\mathbf{V}}}$ is nondegenerate. Thus (a) holds.

It remains to show that (a1) is equivalent to (a1$'$). Note that $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$. Assume (a1$'$) holds. Then $\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2n} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is injective for any $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$ (see the proof of (a) implying (a1$'$) and (a2)). If $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \{0\}$, then $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \oplus K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$ and $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = 0$. If $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \neq \{0\}$, then it is contained in $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}})$. But $\dim \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) \leq 1$. Thus in any case, we have $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}})$. Hence (a1) holds.

Conversely assume (a1) holds. Suppose there exists $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$ such that $\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is not surjective. We have $\dim K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} > \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 - \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$, $\dim I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ and $\dim I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \dim \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) \leq 1$. Hence $\dim(I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} + K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}) \geq \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$. It follows that $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \neq \{0\}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} + K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$. But then $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \subset \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0}) = \{0\}$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\bar{A}^n : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2n}$ is surjective for all $n \in [1, \bar{m}]$. It remains to show that $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}$. Let $U^0 = I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} + K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \subset \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) = \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{U_0})$. We have $\dim(I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}) = \dim \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}}}) \leq 1$ and thus $\dim U^0 \geq \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0 - 1$. Since $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0}) = \{0\}$, $\dim \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{U_0}) \leq 1$. Now $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \subset \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{U_0})$ and thus $I_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} \cap K_{2n,\bar{\mathbf{W}}} = \mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{U_0})$. The proof is completed.

3.5. Let $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \oplus_a \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$. We have

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathrm{span}\{\bar{v}_i, i \in [0, \bar{m}]\} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\bar{u}_i, i \in [0, \bar{m} - 1]\} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{W}}$$

and if $\bar{m} > 0$, then

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \{v \in \mathbf{V} | \beta(v, \bar{u}_i) = \beta_\xi(v, \bar{u}_i) = 0, i \in [0, \bar{m} - 1];\ \beta(v, \bar{v}_j) = \beta_\xi(v, \bar{v}_j) = 0, j \in [0, \bar{m}]\}.$$

The collection of maps $\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^a \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2}$ gives rise to a map

$$\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}},\ \bar{A}(\sum_a w^a) = \sum_a \bar{A}w^a.$$

Note that for any $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and any $v \in \mathbf{V}$, we have

$$\beta(\bar{A}w, v) = \beta_\xi(w, v).$$

It follows that $\bar{A} \in \mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}})$.

Let $\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}} : \mathbf{V} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ be the natural projection. Let $g \in Z_G(\xi) = Z_G(\beta_\xi) = \{g \in G | \beta_\xi(gv, gv') = \beta_\xi(v, v') \ \forall\ v, v' \in \mathbf{V}\}$. We show that

$$\text{(a)} \qquad \begin{aligned} &g\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_i,\ i \in [0, \bar{m}];\ \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(g\bar{A}^j w) = \bar{A}^j \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw),\ \textit{and if } \bar{m} > 0,\ \textit{then} \\ &g\bar{u}_i = \bar{u}_i + \sum_{j \in [0,\bar{m}]} b_{j+i}\bar{v}_i + \bar{A}^i \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(\bar{u}_0),\ i \in [0, \bar{m}-1]; \\ &g\bar{A}^j w = \sum_{i \in [0,\bar{m}]} \beta(\bar{A}^{i+j}\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(\bar{u}_0), \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw))\bar{v}_i + \bar{A}^j \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw),\ w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $g|_R = 1$. Thus $g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}} = \bar{v}_{\bar{m}}$. We have $\beta_\xi(g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}, v) = \beta_\xi(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}, g^{-1}v) = \beta(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1}, g^{-1}v) = \beta(g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1}, v)$ and $\beta_\xi(g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}, v) = \beta_\xi(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}, v) = \beta(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1}, v)$, for any $v \in \mathbf{V}$. Then $g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1} - \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1} \in R$. Since $Q(g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1}) = Q(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1})$, $g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1} = \bar{v}_{\bar{m}-1}$. Similarly, $g\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_i$, $i \in [0, \bar{m}-2]$.

Now for any $\tilde{w} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$, $\beta(\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(g\bar{A}w), \tilde{w}) = \beta(g\bar{A}w, \tilde{w}) = \beta(\bar{A}w, g^{-1}\tilde{w}) = \beta_\xi(w, g^{-1}\tilde{w}) = \beta_\xi(gw, \tilde{w}) = \beta_\xi(\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw), \tilde{w}) = \beta(\bar{A}\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw), \tilde{w})$. Hence $\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(g\bar{A}w) = \bar{A}\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw)$.

Assume $\bar{m} > 0$ and $g\bar{u}_i = \sum_{j \in [0,\bar{m}-1]} a_{ij}\bar{u}_j + \sum_{j \in [0,\bar{m}]} b_{ij}\bar{v}_j + w_i$, where $w_i \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$. We have $a_{ij} = \beta(g\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_j) = \beta(g\bar{u}_i, g\bar{v}_j) = \beta(\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_j) = \delta_{ij}$, $j \in [0, \bar{m}-1]$ and $\beta_\xi(g\bar{u}_i, v) = \beta_\xi(\bar{u}_i, g^{-1}v) = \beta(\bar{u}_{i+1}, g^{-1}v) = \beta(g\bar{u}_{i+1}, v)$. Hence $b_{i,j-1} = b_{i+1,j}$ and $w_{i+1} = \bar{A}w_i$. Assume $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and $gw = \sum_{j \in [0,\bar{m}-1]} x_j\bar{u}_j + \sum_{j \in [0,\bar{m}]} y_j\bar{v}_j + w'$, where $w' \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$. Then $\beta(gw, g\bar{v}_j) = \beta(w, \bar{v}_j) = \beta(gw, \bar{v}_j) = x_j = 0$ and thus $\beta(gw, g\bar{u}_i) = y_i + \beta(\bar{A}^i w_0, w') = 0$, $i \in [0, \bar{m}-1]$, $\beta_\xi(gw, g\bar{u}_{\bar{m}-1}) = y_{\bar{m}} + \beta_\xi(\bar{A}^{\bar{m}-1}w_0, w') = 0$. This completes the proof of (a).

3.6. Assume $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})^0_2$ (see 3.1). Let $\bar{m}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\bar{A}$ be as in 3.3 and 3.5. Let $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a' \geq a}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a'}$. We show by induction on $\dim \mathbf{V}$ that $Z_G(\xi) \subset G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ and thus $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta !}$.

Let k be the largest integer such that $\mathbf{V}^k \neq 0$. If $k = 0$, then $\beta_\xi = 0$, $\xi = 0$, $G^\delta_{\geq 0} = G$ and it is clear that $Z_G(\xi) \subset G^\delta_{\geq 0}$. Assume $k \geq 1$. Note that $k \geq 2\bar{m}$ (since $\bar{v}_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{2\bar{m}}$), and for any $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -k}$, $\bar{A}^{k+1}w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq k+2} = \{0\}$.

Let $g \in Z_G(\xi)$. We first show that $g\mathbf{V}^k = \mathbf{V}^k$ and $g\mathbf{V}^{\geq -k+1} = \mathbf{V}^{\geq -k+1}$ (note that one follows from the other). Suppose that $k > 2\bar{m}$. Then $\mathbf{V}^k = \bar{\mathbf{W}}^k = \bar{A}^k\bar{\mathbf{W}}$. Let $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw) = w'$. Then $g\bar{A}^k w = a\bar{v}_0 + \bar{A}^k w'$ (we use 3.5 (a) and that $\bar{A}^{k+1}w' = 0$). Since $a^2 = Q(g\bar{A}^{k-\bar{m}}w) = Q(\bar{A}^{k-\bar{m}}w) = 0$ (we use 3.5 (a) and note that $\bar{A}^{k-\bar{m}}\bar{\mathbf{W}} \subset \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq 1}$), $g\bar{A}^k w = \bar{A}^k w' \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^k$. It follows that $g\mathbf{V}^k = \mathbf{V}^k$. Suppose now that $k = 2\bar{m}$. Note that $\bar{A} \in \mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}})^0_2$ (with respect to the o-good grading $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \oplus\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$ of $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$, see [3, 1.5] for the definition of $\mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}})^0_2$ and see 3.1 (b′), 3.4 (a1), (a2)). Thus by [3, 1.8], $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1} = \{x \in \bar{\mathbf{W}} | \bar{A}^{2\bar{m}}x = 0, Q(\bar{A}^{\bar{m}}x) = 0\}$. We have $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1} = \operatorname{span}\{\bar{v}_i, i \in [0, \bar{m}]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{\bar{u}_i, i \in [1, \bar{m}-1]\} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$. It is clear that $g\bar{v}_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$ (see 3.5 (a)). Note that for any $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and any $i \geq \bar{m}+1$, $\bar{A}^i w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq 2}$ and thus $Q(\bar{A}^i w) = 0$. Hence $\bar{A}\bar{\mathbf{W}} \subset \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$. It follows that $g\bar{u}_j \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$, $j \in [1, \bar{m}-1]$ (see 3.5 (a)). For any $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$, $\bar{A}^{2\bar{m}}\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw) = \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(g\bar{A}^{2\bar{m}}w) = 0$ (note that $\bar{A}^{2\bar{m}}w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq 2\bar{m}+1} = \{0\}$), $Q(\bar{A}^m\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(gw)) = Q(g\bar{A}^{\bar{m}}w) = Q(\bar{A}^{\bar{m}}w) = 0$ (note that $\bar{A}^{\bar{m}}w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq 1}$) and thus $gw \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$. Hence $g\mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1} = \mathbf{V}^{\geq -2\bar{m}+1}$.

Let $\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}^{\geq -k+1}/\mathbf{V}^k$. Then Q induces a nondegenerate quadratic form Q' on $\mathbf{V}'$. There is a natural (o-good) grading $\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}^{-k+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbf{V}^{k-1}$ on $\mathbf{V}'$ and β_ξ induces a symplectic form $\beta'_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V}')^0_2$ with respect to this grading (note that $\beta_\xi(\mathbf{V}^k, \mathbf{V}^{\geq -k+1}) = \beta_\xi(\bar{\mathbf{W}}^k, \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -k+1}) = \beta(\bar{A}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^k, \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq -k+1}) = 0$). Now $g \in Z_G(\xi)$ induces an element $g' \in Z_{G'}(\beta'_\xi)$, where $G' = SO(\mathbf{V}')$ is defined with respect to Q'. By induction hypothesis, $g'\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}'^{\geq a}$, for all $a \geq -k+1$. It follows that $g\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}^{\geq a}$ for all a and thus $g \in G^\delta_{\geq 0}$.

3.7. Assume $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_2^{*\delta!}$. We show that $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})^0_2$. Let $\bar{m}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\bar{A}$ be defined for β_ξ as in 3.3 and 3.5.

We first show that $\dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}} \geq \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}-2}$. Otherwise $\bar{A} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}-2} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}}$ is not injective. We choose a nonzero $e^{-2\bar{m}-2} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2\bar{m}-2}$ such that $\bar{A}e^{-2\bar{m}-2} = 0$. Assume $\bar{m} = 0$. Define $g : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$, $g \notin G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ by

$$g\bar{v}_{\bar{m}} = \bar{v}_{\bar{m}};\ gw = w + \beta(w, e^{-2\bar{m}-2})(e^{-2\bar{m}-2} + \bar{v}_{\bar{m}}),\ w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}.$$

Let $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$ and $w = \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v)$, $w' = \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v')$. Since $\beta_\xi(\bar{v}_{\bar{m}}, \mathbf{V}) = 0$ and $\beta_\xi(e^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \mathbf{V}) = \beta(\bar{A}e^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \mathbf{V}) = 0$, it is easy to verify that $Q(gv) = Q(w) + a^2 = Q(v)$ and $\beta_\xi(gv, gv') = \beta_\xi(w, w') = \beta_\xi(v, v')$. Thus $g \in Z_G(\xi) \nsubseteq G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ which is a contradiction. Assume $\bar{m} > 0$. Define $g : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$, $g \notin G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &g\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_i,\ i \in [0, \bar{m}];\ g\bar{u}_0 = \bar{u}_0 + e^{-2\bar{m}-2};\ g\bar{u}_i = \bar{u}_i,\ i \in [1, \bar{m}-1]; \\ &gw = w + \beta(w, e^{-2\bar{m}-2})\bar{v}_0,\ w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $v = w + \sum a_i\bar{u}_i + \sum b_i\bar{v}_i$ and $v' = w' + \sum a'_i\bar{u}_i + \sum b'_i\bar{v}_i$ in $\mathbf{V}$ (where $w = \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v)$, $w' = \pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v')$), since $\beta_\xi(\bar{v}_0, \mathbf{V}) = 0$ and $\beta_\xi(e^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \mathbf{V}) = \beta(\bar{A}e^{-2\bar{m}-2}, \mathbf{V}) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(gv) &= Q(v + \beta(w, e^{-2\bar{m}-2})\bar{v}_0 + a_0e^{-2\bar{m}-2}) = Q(v) + \beta(v, \beta(w, e^{-2\bar{m}-2})\bar{v}_0 + a_0e^{-2\bar{m}-2}) = Q(v), \\ \beta_\xi(gv, gv') &= \beta_\xi(v + \beta(w, e^{-2\bar{m}-2})\bar{v}_0 + a_0e^{-2\bar{m}-2}, v' + \beta(w', e^{-2\bar{m}-2})\bar{v}_0 + a'_0e^{-2\bar{m}-2}) = \beta_\xi(v, v'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $g \in Z_G(\xi) \nsubseteq G^\delta_{\geq 0}$, which is again a contradiction.

Hence $\bar{\mathbf{W}} = \oplus_a\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a$ is an o-good grading of $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$. Note that $\bar{A} \in \mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}})_2 = \{T \in \mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}}) | T\bar{\mathbf{W}}^a \subset \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{a+2}\}$. Let $SO(\bar{\mathbf{W}})_{\geq 0} = \{g \in SO(\bar{\mathbf{W}}) | g\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq a} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{\geq a},\ \forall\ a\}$.

We show that $\bar{A} \in \mathfrak{o}(\bar{\mathbf{W}})^0_2$, namely, $\bar{A}^i : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-i} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^i$ is an isomorphism for any odd i, $\bar{A}^i : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2i} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is injective and $Q|_{\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^i : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2i} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)}$ is nondegenerate for all $i \geq 1$ (see [3, 1.5]). Otherwise by [3, 1.8] there exists $g_0 \in Z_{SO(\bar{\mathbf{W}})}(\bar{A})$ such that $g_0 \notin SO(\bar{\mathbf{W}})_{\geq 0}$. Define $g : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$ by $gw = g_0w$ for all $w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$ and $g\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_i$, $g\bar{u}_i = \bar{u}_i$. Note that $g \notin G^\delta_{\geq 0}$. For any $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$ with $\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v) = w$ and $\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v') = w'$, since $\beta_\xi(g_0w, g_0w') = \beta(\bar{A}g_0w, g_0w') = \beta(g_0\bar{A}w, g_0w') = \beta(\bar{A}w, w') = \beta_\xi(w, w')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(gv) &= Q(v + g_0w + w) = Q(v) + \beta(v, g_0w + w) + Q(g_0w + w) \\ &= Q(v) + \beta(w, g_0w + w) + Q(g_0w) + Q(w) + \beta(g_0w, w) = Q(v) \\ \beta_\xi(gv, gv') &= \beta_\xi(v + g_0w + w, v' + g_0w' + w') = \beta_\xi(v, v') + \beta_\xi(w, g_0w' + w') + \beta_\xi(g_0w + w, w') \\ &\quad + \beta_\xi(g_0w + w, g_0w' + w') = \beta_\xi(v, v') + \beta_\xi(g_0w, g_0w') + \beta_\xi(w, w') = \beta_\xi(v, v'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $g \in Z_G(\xi) \nsubseteq G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ which is a contradiction.

We show that for all $k \geq \bar{m} + 1$, $\bar{A}^{2k} : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2k}$ is an isomorphism. Otherwise there exist a k and a nonzero $e^{-2k} \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k}$ such that $\bar{A}^{2k}e^{-2k} = 0$. We have $e^0 = \bar{A}^k e^{-2k} \neq 0$ (since $\bar{A}^k : \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k} \to \bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ is injective). Let $e^{2j-2k} = \bar{A}^j e^{-2k}$ for $j \in [0, 2k]$. Note that $\beta(e^{2j-2k}, e^{2k-2j}) =$

$\beta(\bar{A}^{2k}e^{-2k},e^{-2k})=0$ and $\beta_\xi(e^{2j-2k},e^{2k-2j-2})=\beta(\bar{A}e^{2j-2k},e^{2k-2j-2})=\beta(e^{2j-2k+2},e^{2k-2j-2})=0$. Fix a square root $\sqrt{Q(e^0)}$ of $Q(e^0)$. Define $g:\mathbf{V}\to\mathbf{V}$, $g\notin G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&g\bar{v}_i=\bar{v}_i,\ i\in[0,\bar{m}];\ g\bar{u}_i=\bar{u}_i+\sqrt{Q(e^0)}e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2},\ i\in[0,\bar{m}-1];\\
&gw=w+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)e^{2j-2k}+\sum_{j\in[0,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\bar{v}_j,\ w\in\bar{\mathbf{W}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any $v=w+\sum a_i\bar{v}_i+\sum b_i\bar{u}_i$ and $v'=w'+\sum a'_i\bar{v}_i+\sum b'_i\bar{u}_i$ in $\mathbf{V}$ (where $w=\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v)$, $w'=\pi_{\bar{\mathbf{W}}}(v')$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q(gv)=Q(v+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2}+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)e^{2j-2k}\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\bar{v}_j)\\
=\ &Q(v)+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\beta(w,e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2})b_i+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)\beta(w,e^{2j-2k})\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}b_j+\beta(e^{-2},w)^2Q(e^0)+(\beta(e^{-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)})^2\\
=\ &Q(v)+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)\beta(w,e^{2j-2k})=Q(v)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_\xi(gv,gv')=\beta_\xi(v+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2}+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)e^{2j-2k}\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\bar{v}_j,v'+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b'_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2}\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w')e^{2j-2k}+\sum_{j\in[0,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w')\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\bar{v}_j)\\
=\ &\beta_\xi(v,v')+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\beta_\xi(e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2},w')+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)\beta_\xi(w',e^{2j-2k})\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[1,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}b'_{j-1}+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b'_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\beta_\xi(e^{2i-2\bar{m}-2},w)\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-1]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w')\beta_\xi(e^{2j-2k},w)+\sum_{j\in[1,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w')\sqrt{Q(e^0)}b_{j-1}\\
=\ &\beta_\xi(v,v')+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\beta(e^{2i-2\bar{m}},w')+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-2]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w)\beta(w',e^{2j-2k+2})\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[1,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w)\sqrt{Q(e^0)}b'_{j-1}+\sum_{i\in[0,\bar{m}-1]}b'_i\sqrt{Q(e^0)}\beta(e^{2i-2\bar{m}},w)\\
&\qquad+\sum_{j\in[0,2k-2]}\beta(e^{2k-2j-2},w')\beta(e^{2j-2k+2},w)+\sum_{j\in[1,\bar{m}]}\beta(e^{2j-2\bar{m}-2},w')\sqrt{Q(e^0)}b_{j-1}\\
=\ &\beta_\xi(v,v').
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $g\in Z_G(\xi)\not\subseteq G^\delta_{\geq 0}$ which is again a contradiction. It follows that $\mathrm{Rad}(Q|_{\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^k:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k}\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)})=\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^k:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k}\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)\cap\ker(\bar{A}^k:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{2k})=\{0\}$. Thus $\dim\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k}=\dim\mathrm{Im}(\bar{A}^k:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2k}\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)$ is even. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

4.1. For $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a}) \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ (see 2.3), let $\eta(\mathbf{V}_*)$ be the set of all $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ such that $\beta_\xi(\mathbf{V}^{\geq a}, \mathbf{V}^{\geq b}) = 0$ whenever $a + b \geq -1$, and that the symplectic bilinear form $\bar{\beta}_\xi$ induced by β_ξ is in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0$ (with respect to the corresponding o-good grading $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{V}^a$ such that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a'\geq a}\mathbf{V}^{a'}$), where $\bar{\beta}_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2$ is defined as follows

$$\bar{\beta}_\xi(\sum_a x^a, \sum_a y^a) = \sum_a \beta_\xi(x^a, y^{-a-2}), \text{ for all } x^a \in \mathbf{V}^a, y^a \in \mathbf{V}^a.$$

Note that we have $\eta(\mathbf{V}_*) \subset \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$.

Proposition 4.1. *The map*

$$\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_*\in\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})}\eta(\mathbf{V}_*) \to \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}, \ \beta_\xi \mapsto \beta_\xi$$

is a bijection.

When $p \neq 2$, the map $\beta_\xi \mapsto A$, where $\beta_\xi(v, v') = \beta(Av, v')$ for all $v, v' \in \mathbf{V}$, defines a bijection $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{N}_\mathfrak{g}$ and a bijection $\eta(\mathbf{V}_*) \xrightarrow{\sim} \eta'(\mathbf{V}_*)$, where $\mathcal{N}_\mathfrak{g}$ is the set of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\eta'(\mathbf{V}_*)$ is as in [3, A.4]. Thus the proposition follows from [3, A.4(a)] in this case. The proof when $p = 2$ will be given in 4.2-4.5.

In view of the identification of $\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ with D_G (see 2.3) and the identification of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_{nil}$ with $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ (see 2.4), Theorem 2.1 follows from Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 3.1.

4.2. We assume $p = 2$ through subsection 4.5. Let $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_a\mathbf{V}^a$ be an o-good grading such that $\beta_\xi \in \eta(\mathbf{V}_*)$, where $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a'\geq a}\mathbf{V}^{a'}$. Let $\bar{\beta}_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0$ be the symplectic bilinear form induced by β_ξ (see 4.1).

Let $\{v_i, i \in [0, m]\}$ be the unique set of vectors defined for β_ξ as in 2.4 (a). Assume $m > 0$. We choose a vector $u_0 \in \mathbf{V}$ such that

$$\text{(a) } \beta(u_0, v_0) = 1, \beta(u_0, v_i) = 0, i \in [1, m-1], \ Q(u_0) = 0.$$

Let $\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\}$ be the unique set of vectors (see [6, Lemma 3.6]) such that

$$Q(u_i) = 0; \ \beta(u_i, v) = \beta_\xi(u_{i-1}, v), \ \forall\ v \in \mathbf{V}.$$

Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a subspace of $\mathbf{V}$ such that

$$\text{(b)} \qquad \mathbf{W} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{v_m\} = \mathbf{V}, \text{ if } m = 0;$$
$$\mathbf{W} = \{v \in \mathbf{V} | \beta(v, v_i) = \beta(u, u_i) = 0, i \in [0, m-1], \ \beta_\xi(v, u_{m-1}) = 0\}, \text{ if } m > 0.$$

Then $\mathbf{V} = \operatorname{span}\{v_i, i \in [0, m]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{u_i, i \in [0, m-1]\} \oplus \mathbf{W}$ (see [6, Lemma 3.8]) and $\beta|_\mathbf{W}$ is nondegenerate. Define

$$T_\xi : \mathbf{W} \to \mathbf{W} \text{ by } \beta(T_\xi w, w') = \beta_\xi(w, w'), \ \forall\ w, w' \in \mathbf{W}.$$

Then for any $x \in \mathbf{W}$ and any $v \in \mathbf{V}$, $\beta_\xi(x, v) = \beta(T_\xi x, v)$. Moreover $T_\xi \in \mathfrak{o}(\mathbf{W})$ is nilpotent (see [6, Lemma 3.11]). Let $\pi_\mathbf{W} : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{W}$ denote the natural projection.

Let λ_1 be the smallest integer such that $T_\xi^{\lambda_1}\mathbf{W} = 0$. Let

$$l_1 = \max(\lambda_1 - m, f),$$

where f is the smallest integer such that $Q(T_\xi^f\mathbf{W}) = 0$. Note that $l_1 \geq [\frac{\lambda_1+1}{2}]$ and $\xi = 0$ iff $m = \lambda_1 = 0$.

From now on assume $\xi \neq 0$ unless otherwise stated. Let

$$\rho : \ker T_\xi^{\lambda_1 - 1} \to \mathbf{k}$$

be the map $w \mapsto Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1} w)$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda_{\mathbf{W}} = \{x \in \mathbf{W} | Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}x) = 0\} \ \text{ if } \lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1, \\ &\Lambda_{\mathbf{W}} = \ker \rho \quad \text{if } m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1; \end{aligned}$$

and define a subspace $H_{\beta_\xi} \subset \mathbf{V}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{\beta_\xi} = \operatorname{span}\{v_m\} \oplus \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}, \ \text{ if } m = 0; \\ &H_{\beta_\xi} = \operatorname{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\} \oplus \mathbf{W}, \ \text{ if } m \geq l_1; \\ &H_{\beta_\xi} = \operatorname{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\} \oplus \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}, \ \text{ if } \lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1, \\ &\qquad\qquad 0 < m = \lambda_1 - l_1 = l_1 - 1, \ \text{ or } 0 < m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1 \text{ and } \rho \neq 0; \\ &H_{\beta_\xi} = \operatorname{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\} \oplus \operatorname{span}\{u_0 + w_{**}\} \oplus \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}, \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{if } 0 < m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1 \text{ and } \rho = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $w_{**} \in \mathbf{W}$ is defined as follows. There exists a unique $w_* \in \mathbf{W}$ such that $\beta(w_*, w)^2 = Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}w)$ for all $w \in \mathbf{W}$. Since $\rho = 0$, $w_* \in (\ker T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1})^\perp \cap \mathbf{W} = T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}\mathbf{W}$. We choose any $w_{**} \in \mathbf{W}$ such that $w_* = T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1} w_{**}$ (the defintion of H_{β_ξ} does not depend on the choice).

Assume $m = 0$. We show that the definition of H_{β_ξ} does not depend of the choice of $\mathbf{W}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ be another complementary subspace of $\operatorname{span}\{v_m\}$ in $\mathbf{V}$ and let $\tilde{T}_\xi : \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \to \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ be defined as $T_\xi : \mathbf{W} \to \mathbf{W}$. Then one easily shows that for any $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{T}_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}\tilde{w}) = T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}))$. Now the assertion is clear (note that $\rho = 0$).

Assume $m > 0$. We show that the definition of H_{β_ξ} does not depend of the choice of u_0 (see (a)). Assume we choose another $\tilde{u}_0$ satisfying (a) and define $\tilde{u}_i$, $i \in [1, m-1]$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, $\tilde{T}_\xi : \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \to \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ as u_i, $i \in [1, m-1]$, $\mathbf{W}$, $T_\xi : \mathbf{W} \to \mathbf{W}$. By same argument as in 3.5 one shows that

(c) $\tilde{u}_j = u_j + \sum_{i \in [0,m]} a_{i+j} v_i + T_\xi^j w_0, \ j \in [0, m-1]$,

(d) $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = \{\sum_{i \in [0,m]} \beta(w, T_\xi^i w_0) v_i + w | w \in \mathbf{W}\}, \ \pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{T}_\xi \tilde{w}) = T_\xi(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w})), \ \tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$,

where $w_0 = \pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{u}_0)$ and $a_{2j} + a_{m+j}^2 + Q(T_\xi^j w_0) = 0$, $j \in [0, m-1]$.

We first show that λ_1 and l_1 do not depend on the choice of u_0. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{l}_1$ be defined for $\tilde{T}_\xi$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ as λ_1, l_1. It follows from (d) that $T_\xi^e \mathbf{W} = 0$ if and only if $\tilde{T}_\xi^e \tilde{\mathbf{W}} = 0$ and that

(e) $\ker \tilde{T}_\xi^{\lambda_1-1} \subset \ker T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1} \oplus \mathit{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\}$.

Thus $\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1$. It also follows that $Q(\tilde{T}_\xi^{l_1}\tilde{w}) = Q(T_\xi^{l_1}(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}))) = 0$ for all $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ (note that $m + l_1 \geq \lambda_1$). Thus $\tilde{l}_1 \leq l_1$. Similarly $l_1 \leq \tilde{l}_1$. Hence $l_1 = \tilde{l}_1$.

Let $\tilde{\rho} : \ker \tilde{T}_\xi^{\lambda_1-1} \to \mathbf{k}$ be the map $\tilde{w} \mapsto Q(\tilde{T}_\xi^{l_1-1}\tilde{w})$. For any $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, $\tilde{T}_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}\tilde{w} = 0$ if and only if $T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w})) = 0$; and if $\tilde{T}_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}\tilde{w} = 0$, then $Q(\tilde{T}_\xi^{l_1-1}\tilde{w}) = Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w})))$ (we use (d)). Thus $\rho = 0$ if and only if $\tilde{\rho} = 0$. It also follows that

(f) $\ker \tilde{\rho} \subset \ker \rho \oplus \mathit{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\}$.

Now we denote $H_{u_0} \subset \mathbf{V}$ the subspace in the right hand side of the definition of H_{β_ξ} and let $H_{\tilde{u}_0} \subset \mathbf{V}$ be defined as H_{u_0} with $u_i, \mathbf{W}, T_\xi$, $\Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}$ replaced by $\tilde{u}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}, \tilde{T}_\xi$, $\Lambda_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}}$. We need to show that $H_{u_0} = H_{\tilde{u}_0}$. If $m \geq l_1$, then this is clear since $H_{\tilde{u}_0} \subset H_{u_0}$ (see (c) and (d)) and $\dim H_{\tilde{u}_0} = \dim H_{u_0}$. Assume $m < l_1$. We show that

(g) $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{u}_j) \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}$ *for all* $j \geq 1$*;*

(h) $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\Lambda_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}}) \subset \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}$.

In fact, for all $j \geq 1$, we have $T_\xi^{\lambda_1 - 1}(T_\xi^j w_0) = 0$, $Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}(T_\xi^j w_0)) = Q(T^{l_1}(T_\xi^{j-1} w_0)) = 0$ and thus (g) follows from (c). Now if $m > \lambda_1 - l_1$, then $Q(\tilde{T}_\xi^{l_1-1}\tilde{w}) = Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}))$ for any $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ and thus (h) follows; if $m = \lambda_1 - l_1$, then (h) follows from (f).

Assume $\lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1$, $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 = l_1 - 1$, or $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1$ and $\rho \neq 0$. It follows from (g) and (h) that $H_{\tilde{u}_0} \subset H_{u_0}$ (see (d)). Similarly $H_{u_0} \subset H_{\tilde{u}_0}$.

Assume $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1$ and $\rho = 0$. Suppose that $\tilde{w}_* \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ satisfies $\beta(\tilde{w}_*, \tilde{w})^2 = Q(\tilde{T}_\xi^{l_1-1}\tilde{w})$ for any $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathbf{W}}$. Then $\beta(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}_*), w)^2 = Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}w) + \beta(w, T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}w_0)^2 = \beta(w_*, w)^2 + \beta(w, T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}w_0)^2$ for all $w \in \mathbf{W}$ and thus $\beta(\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}_*) + w_* + T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}w_0, \mathbf{W}) = 0$. Hence $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(\tilde{w}_*) = w_* + T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}w_0 = T_\xi^{\lambda_1-1}(w_{**} + w_0)$ and we can choose $\tilde{w}_{**} = w_{**} + w_0 + \sum \beta(w_{**}, T_\xi^i w_0)v_i$. It follows that $\tilde{u}_0 + \tilde{w}_{**} \in H_{u_0}$. It then follows from (g) and (h) that $H_{\tilde{u}_0} \subset H_{u_0}$. Similarly $H_{u_0} \subset H_{\tilde{u}_0}$.

We have shown in each case that H_{β_ξ} is well defined.

Let $L = H_{\beta_\xi}^\perp \cap Q^{-1}(0)$. We show that

(i) $\beta_\xi(L, \mathbf{V}) = 0$.

If $m \geq l_1$, then $m > 0$ and $L = \text{span}\{v_0\}$. If $\lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1$, $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1$ and $\rho \neq 0$, or $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 = l_1 - 1$, then $m > 0$ and $L = \text{span}\{v_0\} \oplus (\Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}^\perp \cap \mathbf{W})$. If $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1$ and $\rho = 0$, then either $m = 0$ or $m > 0$ in which case we can choose u_0 such that $w_{**} = 0$ (see the definition of H_{β_ξ}), and thus $L = \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}^\perp \cap \mathbf{W}$. It is easy to see that $T_\xi \mathbf{W} \subset \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}$. Hence for any $x \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{W}}^\perp \cap \mathbf{W}$, $\beta_\xi(x, \mathbf{W}) = \beta(T_\xi x, \mathbf{W}) = \beta(x, T_\xi \mathbf{W}) = 0$. Now (i) follows since $\beta_\xi(v_0, \mathbf{V}) = 0$ when $m > 0$.

4.3. Let β_ξ, $\bar{\beta}_\xi$, H_{β_ξ}, $\mathbf{V} = \oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$, $\mathbf{V}_*$, m, $\{v_i, i \in [0, m]\}$, λ_1, l_1 be as in 4.2. Let n be the largest integer such that $\mathbf{V}^n \neq 0$.

We have

(a) $v_m \in \mathbf{V}^0$ *and if* $m > 0$, $v_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq j}$, *then* $v_{i-1} \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq j+2}, i \in [1, m]$.

In fact, if $v_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq j}$, then $\beta(v_{i-1}, \mathbf{V}^{\geq -1-j}) = \beta_\xi(v_i, \mathbf{V}^{\geq -1-j}) = 0$. Hence $v_{i-1} \in (\mathbf{V}^{\geq -1-j})^\perp \cap Q^{-1}(0) = \mathbf{V}^{\geq j+2}$. It follows that $v_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq 2m}$ and thus

$$n \geq 2m.$$

Let $n_0 \in [0, n - 2m]$ be the unique integer such that

$$v_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq n - n_0}, \ v_0 \notin \mathbf{V}^{\geq n - n_0 + 1}.$$

If $m > 0$, we (can) choose u_0 such that $u_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n + n_0}$ (see 4.2 (a)). Then the same argument as in the proof of (a) shows that

(b) $u_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+n_0+2i}$, $i \in [0, m-1]$.

It follows from (a) and (b) that

(c) $v_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}, i \in [0,m]$; $u_i \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}, i \in [1, m-1]$; *and if* $n_0 > 0$, *then* $u_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$.

Let $\mathbf{W} \subset \mathbf{V}$ be chosen as in 4.2 (b). We have

(d) *if* $x \in \mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}^{\geq a}$, *then* $T_\xi^b x \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq a+2b} +$ *span*$\{v_i, i \in [\max(0, m-b+1), m]\}$.

In fact, suppose that $T_\xi^{b-1}x = y + \sum_{k\in[\max(0,m-b+1),m]} c_k v_k$, where $y \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq a+2b-2}$. Then $\beta(T_\xi^b x, v) = \beta_\xi(T_\xi^{b-1}x, v) = \beta_\xi(\sum_{k\in[\max(0,m-b+1),m]} c_k v_k, v) = \beta(\sum_{k\in[\max(0,m-b),m-1]} c_{k+1} v_k, v)$ $\forall\, v \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq 1-a-2b}$. Hence $T_\xi^b x - \sum_{k\in[\max(0,m-b),m-1]} c_{k+1} v_k \in (\mathbf{V}^{\geq 1-a-2b})^\perp = \mathbf{V}^{\geq a+2b} + R$ and (d) follows.

It follows from (d) that for all $x \in \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n}$, $T_\xi^{n+1}x \in \mathbf{W} \cap (\mathbf{V}^{\geq n+2} + \mathrm{span}\{v_i\}) = \{0\}$, and $T_\xi^\theta x \in \mathbf{W} \cap (\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+2\theta} + \mathrm{span}\{v_i\})$, where $\theta = [\frac{2n-2m-n_0+2}{2}]$. Assume $T_\xi^\theta x = x_1 + \sum_{i=0}^m c_i v_i$, where $x_1 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+2\theta}$. Then $c_m = \beta_\xi(T_\xi^\theta x, u_{m-1}) = 0$ (note that $u_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+n_0+2m-2}$ and thus $\beta_\xi(x_1, u_{m-1}) = 0$). It follows that $T_\xi^\theta x \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq 1}$ and thus

(e) $Q(T_\xi^{[\frac{2n-2m-n_0+2}{2}]}x) = 0$, $x \in \mathbf{W}$.

Hence we have

(f) $\lambda_1 \leq n+1$;

(g) $l_1 \leq \max([\frac{2n-2m-n_0+2}{2}], \lambda_1 - m)$, *and* $l_1 = \lambda_1 - m$ *if* $[\frac{2n-2m-n_0+2}{2}] \leq \lambda_1 - m$.

Lemma. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = H_{\beta_\xi};\\
&n = 2m \quad \text{if } m \geq l_1, \ \text{or } m = \lambda_1 - l_1 = l_1 - 1,\\
&n = \lambda_1 - 1 \quad \text{if } m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1 \ \text{and } \rho = 0,\\
&n = l_1 + m - 1 \quad \text{if } \lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1, \ \text{or } m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1 \ \text{and } \rho \neq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In general, for $x \in \mathbf{V} = \oplus \mathbf{V}^a$, x^a denotes the $\mathbf{V}^a$ component of x. Let $\bar m$, $\{\bar v_i, i \in [0, \bar m]\}$, $\{\bar u_i, i \in [0, \bar m - 1]\}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}^i$ and $\bar A$ be defined for $\bar\beta_\xi$ as in 3.3 and 3.5 (if $n = 2m$, we choose $\bar u_0 = u_0^{-2m}$ and then $\bar u_{m-1} = u_{m-1}^{-2}$). Note that we have $\bar v_{\bar m} = v_m$; $\bar\beta_\xi(\bar v_{\bar m - i}, \bar w) = \beta(v_{m-i-1}^{2i+2}, \bar w), \bar w \in \bar{\mathbf{W}}$. Hence

(h) $\bar m \leq m$, *and* $\bar m = m$ *iff* $v_0^{2m} \neq 0$.

We first show that

(i) $\mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = \{w \in \mathbf{W} | T_\xi^n w = 0, Q(T_\xi^{n-m} w) = 0\}$.

Let $w \in \mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$, then $T_\xi^n w \in (\mathbf{V}^{\geq n+1} + \mathrm{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\}) \cap \mathbf{W} = \{0\}$. If $n_0 > 0$, then it follows from (e) that $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}w) = 0$. Assume $n_0 = 0$. We have $T_\xi^{n-m}w = y + \sum b_i v_i$ for some $y \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq n+1-2m}$. Since $b_m = \beta_\xi(T_\xi^{n-m}w, u_{m-1}) = 0$ (note that $\beta_\xi(y, u_{m-1})$=0 as $u_{m-1} \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+2(m-1)}$), $T_\xi^{n-m}w \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq 1}$. Hence $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}w) = 0$. This shows that the set in the l.h.s of (i) is a subset of that in the r.h.s of (i).

Let $x \in \mathbf{W}$ be such that $T_\xi^n x = 0$ and $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}x) = 0$. We show that

(j) $\beta(x^{-n},\bar{A}^n\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=0$.

Suppose $x^{-n}=\sum a_iu_i+\sum b_iv_i+w$, where $w=\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(x^{-n})$. Note that if $n_0=0$, then $a_0=\beta(x-x^{-n},v_0)=0$ since $v_0\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq n}$ and $x-x^{-n}\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$. It follows that $x+w\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$ (we use (c)) and thus $T_\xi^nw=0$ and $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}w)=0$. We have $\beta(x^{-n},\bar{A}^n\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\bar{\beta}_\xi(x^{-n},\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta_\xi(x^{-n},\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta_\xi(w,\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})$ (in the last equality we use $x^n-w\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$). It follows from (d) and its proof that

$$T_\xi^iw=y_i+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m}v_j,$$

for some $y_i\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+2i}$, where $D_i=0$ for $i\leq[\frac{n}{2}]$, and D_i for $i>[\frac{n}{2}]$ is the unique number such that $T_\xi^iw+D_iv_m\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+2i}+\text{span}\{v_i,i\in[1,m]\}$. We show by induction on i that

$$\beta_\xi(w,\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta(T_\xi^iw+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m}v_j,\bar{A}^{n-i}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}).$$

In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\beta_\xi(w,\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta(T_\xi w,\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta(T_\xi^iw+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m}v_j,\bar{A}^{n-i}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})\\&=\bar{\beta}_\xi(T_\xi^iw+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m}v_j,\bar{A}^{n-i-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta_\xi(T_\xi^iw+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m}v_j,\bar{A}^{n-i-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})\\&=\beta(T_\xi^{i+1}w+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{i+j-m+1}v_j,\bar{A}^{n-i-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\beta_\xi(w,\bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=\beta(T_\xi^nw+\sum_{j\in[0,m]}D_{n-m+j}v_j,\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n})=0$, since $D_i^2=Q(T_\xi^iw)=0$ for $i\geq n-m+1$ (we use $y_i\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq 1}$ and (e)); if $n=2m$, then $D_{n-m}=D_m=0$; if $n>2m$, then $D_{n-m}^2=Q(T_\xi^{n-m}w)=0$ (note that $Q(y_{n-m})=0$ as $y_{n-m}\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq 1}$). Hence (j) holds.

Now assume first that $n=2m$. We have $\bar{m}=m$, $\bar{v}_0=v_0$ (see (h)) and $x^{-2m}\in\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2m}$ (since $\beta(x^{-2m},v_0)=0$). It follows from (j) that $\bar{A}^mx^{-2m}\in\text{Rad}(Q|_{\text{Im}(\bar{A}^m:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-2m}\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)})$. By a similar argument as above one shows that $\beta(\bar{A}^mx^{-2m},\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)=\beta((T_\xi^mw)^0,\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0)$. Now $(T_\xi^mw)^0\in\bar{\mathbf{W}}^0$ since $\bar{\beta}_\xi((T_\xi^mw)^0,\bar{u}_{m-1})=\beta_\xi(T_\xi^mw,\bar{u}_{m-1})=\beta_\xi(T_\xi^mw,u_{m-1})=0$ (note that we have chosen $\bar{u}_0$ such that $\bar{u}_{m-1}=u_{m-1}^{-2}$). Hence $\bar{A}^mx^{-2m}=(T_\xi^mw)^0$ and $Q(\bar{A}^mx^{-2m})=Q((T_\xi^mw)^0)=Q(T_\xi^mw)=0$. It follows that $\bar{A}^mx^{-2m}=0$ and thus $x^{-2m}=0$ (see 3.4 (a1)). Hence $x\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$.

Assume $n>2m$. Then $\mathbf{V}^{-n}=\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}$ (note that $n>2m\geq 2\bar{m}$). Since $\beta(\bar{A}^nx^{-n},\mathbf{V}^{-n})=\beta(x^{-n},\bar{A}^n\mathbf{V}^{-n})=0$ (see (j)), $\bar{A}^nx^{-n}=0$ and thus $x^{-n}=0$ (we use that $\bar{A}^n:\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}\to\bar{\mathbf{W}}^n$ is an isomorphism). Hence $x\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$. This complets the proof of (i).

Now we prove the lemma. We have the following cases.

(1) $n=2m$. Then $n_0=0$, $\lambda_1\leq 2m+1$ and $l_1\leq m+1$ (see (f) and (g)). If $l_1\leq m$, then $\lambda_1\leq 2l_1\leq 2m$ and thus for any $x\in\mathbf{W}$, $T_\xi^nx=0$ and $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}x)=0$; if $l_1=m+1$, then either $m=\lambda_1-l_1=l_1-1$ or $\lambda_1-l_1<m<l_1$. It follows that $H_{\beta_\xi}=\text{span}\{v_i,i\in[0,m]\}\oplus\text{span}\{u_i,i\in[1,m-1]\}\oplus\{x\in\mathbf{W}|T_\xi^nx=0,Q(T_\xi^{n-m}x)=0\}$ and thus $H_{\beta_\xi}\subset\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$ (see (c) and (i)). Assume $x=\sum a_iv_i+\sum b_iu_i+\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(x)\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$. We have $b_0=\beta(x,v_0)=0$ since $v_0\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq n}$. Then $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(x)\in\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}\cap\mathbf{W}$ (we use (c)) and it follows that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}\subset H_{\beta_\xi}$ (we use (i)).

(2) $n>2m$ and $n_0>0$. We have $\mathbf{V}^{-n}=\bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}$ (since $n>2m\geq 2\bar{m}$). Suppose $\lambda_1\leq n$. Then for any $w\in\mathbf{W}$, $T_\xi^nw=0$ and $Q(T_\xi^{n-m}w)=0$ (see (e)), and it follows that $\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$ (see

(c) and (i)) which is a contradiction. Thus $\lambda_1 = n+1$ and $l_1 = \lambda_1 - m$ (see (f) and (g)). Note that $Q(T_\xi^{l_1-1}\mathbf{W}) = 0$ (see (e)) and thus $\rho = 0$. Hence $H_{\beta_\xi} = \mathrm{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{u_i, i \in [0, m-1]\} \oplus \ker T_\xi^n$. Now it follows from (c) and (i) that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = H_{\beta_\xi}$.

(3) $n > 2m$ and $n_0 = 0$. Let $x = \sum a_i v_i + \sum b_i u_i + \pi_{\mathbf{W}}(x) \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$. We have $b_0 = \beta(x, v_0) = 0$ (since $v_0 \in \mathbf{V}^{\geq n}$) and thus $\pi_{\mathbf{W}}(x) \in \mathbf{W} \cap \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}$. It follows that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = \mathrm{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\} \oplus \{x \in \mathbf{W} | T_\xi^n x = 0, Q(T_\xi^{n-m})x = 0\}$. We show that $l_1 = n-m+1$. Otherwise $l_1 \leq n-m$, then $\lambda_1 \leq n$ (see (g)) and thus $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = \mathrm{span}\{v_i, i \in [0,m]\} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{u_i, i \in [1, m-1]\} \oplus \mathbf{W}$. Hence $\dim \mathbf{V}^{-n} = 1$ which is a contradiction ($\dim \mathbf{V}^{-n} = \dim \bar{\mathbf{W}}^{-n}$ must be even since $n > 2m \geq 2\bar{m}$). Now if $\lambda_1 \leq n$, then $\lambda_1 - l_1 < m < l_1$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = H_{\beta_\xi}$. Assume $\lambda_1 = n+1$, then $m = \lambda_1 - l_1 < l_1 - 1$. We show that in this case $\rho \neq 0$. Otherwise, $\mathbf{V}^n = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1})^\perp \cap Q^{-1}(0) = \mathrm{span}\{v_0\} \oplus ((\ker T_\xi^{\lambda_1 - 1})^\perp \cap \mathbf{W})$ and thus $\dim \mathbf{V}^n$ is odd which is again a contradiction. It follows that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = H_{\beta_\xi}$.

Now it is easy to see that the assertion on n in the lemma holds in each case.

4.4. We prove the injectivity of the map in Proposition 4.1 by induction on $\dim \mathbf{V}$. If $\dim \mathbf{V} = 1$, the statement is clear. Now assume that $\dim \mathbf{V} \geq 3$. Let $\beta_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})$ and let $\mathbf{V}_* = (\mathbf{V}^{\geq a})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_* = (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a})$ be two filtrations in $\mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ such that $\beta_\xi \in \eta(\mathbf{V}_*)$ and $\beta_\xi \in \eta(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_*)$. We need to show that $\mathbf{V}_* = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_*$. If $\beta_\xi = 0$, then $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}$ for all $a \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a} = 0$ for all $a \geq 1$. Now we assume $\beta_\xi \neq 0$.

Let $\oplus_{a=-n}^n \mathbf{V}^a$ and $\oplus_{a=-\tilde{n}}^{\tilde{n}} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^a$ be o-good gradings of $\mathbf{V}$ such that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a' \geq a} \mathbf{V}^{a'}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a} = \oplus_{a' \geq a} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{a'}$. Then $n = \tilde{n}$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq -n+1}$ (see Lemma 4.3). Hence $\mathbf{V}^n = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^n$. Let $\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}^{\geq -n+1}/\mathbf{V}^n = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq -n+1}/\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^n$. Then Q induces a nondegenerate quadratic form on $\mathbf{V}'$. We set $\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}'$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}'$) if $a < -n+1$, $\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}^{\geq a}/\mathbf{V}^n$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'^{\geq a} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a}/\mathbf{V}^n$) if $a \in [-n+1, n]$, and $\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a} = 0$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'^{\geq a} = 0$) if $a > n$. Then $\mathbf{V}'_* = (\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a}) \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V}')$, $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'_* = (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'^{\geq a}) \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V}')$, β_ξ induces a symplectic form $\beta'_\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V}')$ (see 4.2 (i)) and $\beta'_\xi \in \eta(\mathbf{V}'_*)$, $\beta'_\xi \in \eta(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}'_*)$. By induction hypothesis, we have $\mathbf{V}'^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}'^{\geq a}$. It follows that $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a}$ for $a \geq -n+1$. We have $\mathbf{V}^{\geq a} = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\geq a} = \mathbf{V}$ for $a < -n+1$. Hence $\mathbf{V}_* = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_*$.

4.5. We prove the surjectivity of the map in Proposition 4.1 following the arguments used in [4, 2.11]. We can assume that $\mathbf{k}$ is an algebraic closure of the finite field $\mathbf{F}_2$ and that $N = \dim \mathbf{V} \geq 3$. We choose an $\mathbf{F}_2$ rational structure on $\mathbf{V}$ such that Q is defined over $\mathbf{F}_2$. Then the Frobenius map F relative to this $\mathbf{F}_2$ structure acts naturally and compatibly on $\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})} \eta(\mathbf{V}_*)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(V)_{nil}$. It is enough to show that for any $n \geq 1$, the map $\Psi_n : (\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})} \eta(\mathbf{V}_*))^{F^n} \to \mathfrak{S}(V)_{nil}^{F^n}$, $\beta_\xi \mapsto \beta_\xi$ is a bijection. Since Ψ_n is injective (see 4.4), it suffices to show that $|(\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})} \eta(\mathbf{V}_*))^{F^n}| = |\mathfrak{S}(V)_{nil}^{F^n}|$. In view of 2.5 (b), it is enough to show that

(a) $|(\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})} \eta(\mathbf{V}_*))^{F^n}| = 2^{2nN^2}$.

Now the l.h.s of (a) makes sense when $\mathbf{k}$ is replaced by an algebraic closure of any finite prime field $\mathbf{F}_{p'}$, and for $p' \neq 2$, the l.h.s of (a) is equal to p'^{2nN^2}. Hence it is enough to show that the l.h.s of (a) is a polynomial in p'^n with rational coefficients independent of p' and n (following Lusztig, we say that it is *universal*).

We now compute the l.h.s of (a) for general p'. A collection of integers $(f_a)_{a \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called admissible if $f_{-a} = f_a$, f_a is even for odd a, $f_0 \geq f_2 \geq f_4 \geq \cdots$, $f_1 \geq f_3 \geq f_5 \geq \cdots$ and $\sum_a f_a = \dim \mathbf{V}$.

For (f_a) as above, let $\mathcal{Y}_{(f_a)}$ be the set of $\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})$ such that $\dim gr_a(\mathbf{V}_*) = f_a$ for all a, where $gr_a(\mathbf{V}_*) = \mathbf{V}^{\geq a}/\mathbf{V}^{\geq a+1}$. We have $|(\sqcup_{\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathfrak{F}_o(\mathbf{V})} \eta(\mathbf{V}_*))^{F^n}| = \sum_{(f_a)} |\mathcal{Y}_{(f_a)}^{F^n}||\eta(\mathbf{V}_*)^{F^n}|$, where $\mathbf{V}_*$ is any fixed element in $\mathcal{Y}_{(f_a)}^{F^n}$. Since $|\mathcal{Y}_{(f_a)}^{F^n}|$ is *universal*, it is enough to show that $|\eta(\mathbf{V}_*)^{F^n}|$ is *universal* for any $\mathbf{V}_* \in \mathcal{Y}_{(f_a)}^{F^n}$. It is easy to see that $|\eta(\mathbf{V}_*)^{F^n}| = p'^{nd}|(\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0)^{F^n}|$, where $d = \sum_{a<a', a+a' \leq -3} f_a f_{a'} + \sum_{a \leq -2} f_a(f_a - 1)/2$ is *universal* and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0$ is defined with respect to an o-good grading $\oplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{V}^a$ of $\mathbf{V}$ such that $\dim \mathbf{V}^a = f_a$ and $F(\mathbf{V}^a) = \mathbf{V}^a$ for all a. Let s' be the number of all sequences $U_0 \subset U_2 \subset U_4 \subset \cdots$ of subspaces of $\mathbf{V}^0$ such that $\dim U_a = f_0 - f_a$ and $Q|_{U_a}$ is nondegenerate for all a. Let s'' be the number of all pairs $(\omega, (U_1, U_3, U_5, \ldots))$ where ω is a nondegenerate symplectic form on $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$ and $U_1 \subset U_3 \subset U_5 \subset \cdots$ are subspaces of $\mathbf{V}^{-1}$ such that $\dim U_a = f_{-1} - f_a$ and $\omega|_{U_a}$ is nondegenerate for all a. Let s_1 be the number of vector space isomorphisms $\mathbf{V}^{-1}/U_{2a+1} \to \mathbf{V}^{2a+1}$ and let s_2 be the number of vector space isomorphisms $\mathbf{V}^0/U_{2a} \to \mathbf{V}^{2a}$. We have that $|(\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{V})_2^0)^{F^n}| = s's''s_1s_2$ is *universal*, since s', s'', s_1, s_2 are *universal* (see [2, 1.2(a),1.2(b)]). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1 and thus that of Theorem 2.1.

4.6. Assume that $\mathbf{k}$ is an algebraic closure of a finite prime field $\mathbf{F}_p$ and that a split $\mathbf{F}_p$-rational structure is given on G. Then $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ have induced $\mathbf{F}_p$-structures, each $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{U}_G$ and each subset $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^{\mathcal{O}}$ (see 2.1) are defined over $\mathbf{F}_p$ (with Frobenius map F). As in [4], it follows from the proof in 4.5 that

for all $n \geq 1$, $|(\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}^*}^{\mathcal{O}})^{F^n}|$ *is a polynomial of* p^n *with integer coefficients independent of* p *and* n.

REFERENCES

[1] V. Kac, B. Weisfeiler, Coadjoint action of a semi-simple algebraic group and the center of the enveloping algebra in characteristic p. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 79=Indag. Math. 38 (1976), no. 2, 136-151.

[2] G. Lusztig, Unipotent elements in small characteristic, II. Transform. Groups 13 (2008), 773-797.

[3] G. Lusztig, Unipotent elements in small characteristic, III. doi:10.1016/j.algebra.2009.12.008.

[4] G. Lusztig, Unipotent elements in small characteristic, IV. Transform. Groups 15 (2010), 921-936.

[5] T. A. Springer, The Steinberg function of a finite Lie algebra. Invent. Math. 58 (1980), no. 3, 211-215.

[6] T. Xue, Nilpotent orbits in the dual of classical Lie algebras in characteristic 2 and the Springer correspondence. Represent. Theory 13 (2009), 609-635 (electronic).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, IL 60208, USA

E-mail address: `txue@math.northwestern.edu`